

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Final Office Action mailed on July 26, 2006, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the following remarks and arguments are respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action, the specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for an "adsorption coating." It is believed that an "absorption coating" is meant. Applicants strongly disagree and submit that the specification, including the figures, provide ample support for an "absorption coating". For example, page 4, lines 10-11, and lines 29-30; page 5, lines 5-6, lines 19-21, and lines 23-26; and page 6, line 27 of the specification, and reference numerals 22 and 2 in FIGs 1A and FIGs 3, respectively, describe the "absorption coating". Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the specification and figures provide proper antecedent basis for an "absorption coating," and withdrawal of this objection of the specification is respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action, claims 5, 6, 10 and 23 are

objected to for certain informalities. Further, claims 6-7 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as allegedly indefinite. Without agreeing with the Examiner, and in the interest of advancing prosecution, claims 5-8, 10, and 16-17 have been amended to remove the informalities noted by the Examiner. As to claim 23, it is respectfully submitted that claim 23 depends from claim 22 which recites "absorption coating" on the last line, thus providing proper antecedent basis for the same in claim 23. It is respectfully submitted that the objection of claims 5, 8, 10 and 23 and rejection of claims 6-7 and 16-17 have been overcome and an indication as such is respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-5, 8-15, 18-22 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 1,522,252 (Luyties). Further, claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly unpatentable over Luyties in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,281,630 (English). In response, independent claims 1, 11 and 18 have been amended to better clarify the present invention. No new issues requiring a new search have been introduced, as the amended features of independent claims 1, 11 and 18 were already included in the dependent claims.

Accordingly, entry of the present amendment is respectfully requested. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-25 are patentable over Luyties and English for at least the following reasons.

Luyties is directed to a lamp bulb 2 having a frosted portion from a transverse plane through the bulb filament 4 up to the tip 10, as shown in FIG 1 and recited on page 1, lines 106-109. The remaining portion of the Luyties bulb is "clear transparent" as specifically recited on page 1, line 98.

In stark contrast, the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 11 and 18, amongst other patentable elements, requires (illustrative emphasis provided):

a first coating and a second coating are provided on at least part of the outer envelope, the first coating being such that, during operation of the lamp to illuminate a traffic space with the low-beam function, at least a first region of the traffic space above the bright-dark cut-off is at least partly illuminated with visibly colored light scattered at the first coating, a second region of the traffic space below the bright-dark cut-off then being illuminated with visible light of a different color in defined regions transmitted through the second coating.

It is respectfully submitted that Luyties does not teach or suggest a lamp with first and second coatings. Rather, Luyties merely teaches a lamp with a frosted portion, while the remaining Luyties bulb is "clear transparent". A second coating, as recited in independent claims 1, 11 and 18, is nowhere taught or suggested in Luyties.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 11 and 18 should be allowable, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-10, 12-17 and 19-25 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from amended independent claims 1, 11 and 18.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of

the Examiner's statements are conceded.

It is believed that no additional fees or charges are currently due. However, in the event that any additional fees or charges are required for entrance of the accompanying amendment, they may be charged to Applicants' representatives Deposit Account No. 50-3649. In addition, please credit any overpayments related to any fees paid in connection with the accompanying amendment to Deposit Account No. 50-3649.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
August 28, 2006

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101